

two or more integers, wherein said difference between two or more integers is used to initiate movement in the game.

12. (New) A method of playing a board game as described in claim 3, wherein the playing pieces, game board, and method of play all exist as data within a computer, and wherein at least a portion of such data is displayed on output means; said output means being comprised of a computer monitor or LCD screen.

REMARKS- General

The Objection To The Claims Under 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claims 4 and 6 were previously object to as being in improper form because of being multiple dependent claims. This claims have been replaced by claims 10 and 12, which have been rewritten to avoid a form that would classify these claims as multiple dependent claims.

The Rejection Of The Claims Under 35 U.S.C

Claims 1-4,6 were rejected as being indefinite. Claim 1, which was replaced by claim 7, had a preamble that indicated Applicants were intending to claim an apparatus, whereas Claim 3 had a preamble indicating a method as that which was being claim. This caused confusion as to what Applicants specifically regard as the invention. Thus, the new claims, all indicate methods, due to the fact, that Applicants regard the method of play and the method by which a playable game board may be derived as their invention. Applicants have no intention of trying to regard an apparatus as their invention.

It was also stated by the examiner that Claim 1 was indefinite due to the statement integers were considered *both* positive and negative. Applicants no longer refer to integers in this manner. Instead integers are now referred to as *either* positive or negative.

The Rejection Of The Claims Under 35 U.S.C 102 (b)

Claim 5 was rejected as being anticipated by Cohen (2811360). Examiner pointed out that Cohen has already teaches a game board having integers on spaces

and that rules for playing a game do not further limit an apparatus. However, claim 10, which replaced claim 5, has been written as a method claim so that the rules described therein do not further limit the claim. Upon investigation by Applicants it is their belief that no prior art exists which would have anticipated the method of game play described in claim 10.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that the claims are all in proper form and the claims all define patentability over the prior art. Therefore they submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action they respectfully solicit.

Very Respectively,



John Thomas Arana



Michael Arthur Kaiser-Mistriell

-----Applicants Pro Se -----

3358 Caminito Luna Nueva
Del Mar, CA 92014
Tel 858-792-7774